

SCORING OF APPLICATIONS

Scoring Criteria

Applicant's proposal submissions will be evaluated using the following confidence ratings based on the below weighted criteria. Confidence ratings are another form of objective rating that allow evaluators to assign ratings more holistically. Confidence ratings provide evaluators the ability to look more holistically at the strong points and weak points of a proposal to capture raters' overall confidence in the applicant's likelihood to succeed, helping smaller organizations who may be stronger overall than some more seasoned larger organizations. Confidence ratings are identified by the federal government as an innovative practice that may help with reducing the lead time from solicitation to award.:

3 – Confident	The Reviewers are confident that the applicant understands the requirements, proposes a sound and relevant project, and will be successful in implementing the proposed project.
2 – Somewhat Confident	The Reviewers are somewhat confident that the applicant understands the requirements, proposes a sound and relevant project and will be successful in implementing the proposed project.
1 – Not confident	The Reviewers are not confident that the applicant understands the requirements, proposes a sound and relevant project, and will be successful in implementing the proposed project.

Also, each criterion is attributed a specific weight out of 100 points.

Criterion A: Project Goals and Grant Program Priorities (1-3 rating; weighted at 25/100 points)

In line with the priorities for the FY 2024 Food System Infrastructure Grant Program, the proposal (25 points):

- Demonstrates a strong understanding of the County's cold storage infrastructure needs related to food recovery and/or local sourcing initiatives, and
- Proposes an effective project to effectively meet these needs and the needs of individuals experiencing food insecurity in Montgomery County, and
- Demonstrates technical and culturally proficient services, inclusivity of underserved community members, and the use of a racial equity lens in providing services within this proposal.

Criterion B: Sound Fiscal Management and Budget (1-3 rating; weighted at 20/100 points)

- Applicant demonstrates sound grant and fiscal management practices and will be able to submit financial reports and back-up documentation to meet administrative and audit requirements;
- Expenses listed in the Budget and Budget Justification are consistent with the Project Strategy and other parts of the proposal; and
- Applicant's Budget and Budget Justification reflect reasonable and realistic costs needed to implement the proposal, are based upon robust research, and achieve the stated outcomes for the target population/community.

Criterion C: Organizational Capability and Relevant Experience (1-3 rating; weighted at 20/100 points)

- Applicant demonstrates the expertise necessary to deliver the proposed outcomes to support reaching the target population;
- Applicant demonstrates the capability to effectively contribute to food security programs in Montgomery County through food recovery and/or local sourcing initiatives, as evidenced by previous engagement within the local food security community.

Criterion D: Performance Plan and Performance History (1-3 rating; weighted at 20/100 points)

- Applicant demonstrates in their Performance Plan a clear process to measure/evaluate its project and comply with the required metrics and

evaluation;

- Proposal's choice of KPI's/metrics, milestones, other evaluation methods, and ultimate outcomes fit the project strategy and Grant Program's goals;
- Performance History provides strong evidence that the project strategy will have the desired outcomes for the target population/community; and
- Performance History provides a strong justification for the Performance Plan's choice of KPI's/metrics, milestones, other evaluation methods, and ultimate outcomes.

Criterion E: Soundness of the Overall Proposal (1-3 rating; weighted at 15/100 points)

- Proposal clearly demonstrates the effectiveness of proposed activities and, if funded, will result in the accomplishment of their stated outcomes;
- The implementation plan within the proposal is realistic and achievable based on the proposed timeline; and
- Proposal's contingency plans for a lower than requested funding amount is realistic and still results in desired outcomes albeit at a lower level.

MISCELLANEOUS

- Those persons scoring the proposals on the Review Committee will confirm that they have no conflicts of interest.
- Scores and award amounts are non-appealable.
- Scorers' comments and the scores themselves are deliberative and privileged and will not be released. However, applicants may request a feedback report from Manna Food Center summarizing the Review Committees feedback. Funded proposals will be announced publicly, and successful grant applications and award letters may be subject to release (with redactions as allowed by law).